

Serial No.: 10/603,408
Docket No.: 60655.1000

REMARKS

Applicant hereby replies to the Office Action mailed on January 14, 2005 within the shortened statutory three-month period for reply. Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, Applicant amends independent claims 1-6, and add new dependent claims 7-10. As such, claims 1-10 are pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested. No new matter is added by these amendments.

The Examiner noted that Figure 1 should be labeled "Prior Art" because only that which is old is illustrated. Applicant submits a corrected Figure 1 labeled "Prior Art". To expedite prosecution, Applicant submits a replacement drawing sheet in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(d). No new matter is added by the replacement drawings.

Objection under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a)

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). The Examiner stated, "The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the limitations of claim 1 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s)." Applicant maintains that all of the limitations of claim 1 are shown in the drawings as follows:

creating, via a host computer, definitions comprising at least one of sorting criteria, filter criteria, date range, file format, accounting codes and formatting criteria; (see, e.g., FIG 3, steps 308, 310, 312, 315 - FIG. 4, steps 402 and 404)

creating, via said host computer, an interface file including said definitions; (see, e.g., FIG 3, steps 302-316)

reading, via said host computer, data from a first source; (see, e.g., FIG 5, step 502)

reading, via said host computer, said definitions contained in said interface file; and (e.g., FIG 5, step 504)

translating, via said host computer, said data from said first source according to said definitions contained in said interface file (see, e.g., FIG 5, steps 506-508).

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner next rejects claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the Examiner asserts that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. To expedite prosecution, Claim 1 has been amended to

Serial No.: 10/603,408
Docket No.: 60655.1000

specify that the recited steps are performed via a "computer-implemented" method and "via a host computer." Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1, either directly or indirectly, and thus the statutory subject matter is incorporated into claims 2-6.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner next rejects claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Coleman, U.S. Patent 5,708,825. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Coleman generally discloses a system for converting data between disparate systems in order to make data usable to a receiving computing system. The converter of Coleman performs a series of steps used to map data from one database to another.

Coleman is limited to a hardware independent conversion engine that converts data from a first database to a platform neutral data type, then converts the platform neutral format to a format suitable to a second database. A user interacting with the system of Coleman through a user interface enters logical associations between database tables of a first database and a second disparate database. The user next maps individual fields from the first tables to fields of the second tables.

Coleman is clearly directed toward the transformation of data from a first database to a second database in order to maintain uniformity and integrity of the data. For example, a user of the Coleman system may interact with an interface to indicate that a "cust_last_name" field in a first database table should correspond with a "lastName" field in a second database table. The system of Coleman formats data from "cust_last_name" field of the first database table to a neutral format, then converts the neutral format to a format suitable for the "lastName" field of the second database table. Coleman is not directed to the modification of the data itself outside of its data type (e.g. text, memo, date/time, currency, boolean, etc.). In other words, Coleman is not concerned with defining how the data should be sorted, filtered, selected, etc. during the conversion process. Significantly, the data as converted by Coleman will exist according to the data type definitions of the receiving database only, and not by secondary formatting definitions. As such, Coleman does not disclose or suggest, "defining at least one of sorting criteria, filter criteria, date range, file format, accounting codes and formatting criteria" as recited by independent claim 1.

Serial No.: 10/603,408
Docket No.: 60655.1000

Claims 2-6 depend from independent claim 1, so dependent claims 2-6 are differentiated from the cited reference for at least the same reasons as set forth above for differentiating independent claim 1 from the cited reference, as well as in view of their own respective features.

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2814. Applicant invites the Office to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner has any questions regarding this Reply or the present application in general.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 28, 2005

By: 

Howard Sobelman
Reg. No. 39,038

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
400 E. Van Buren
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Phone: 602-382-6228
Fax: 602-382-6070
Email: hsobelman@swlaw.com